

Probable ratio of the vacuum energy in a Schwarzschild-de Sitter space

Li Xiang* and Y. G. Shen

Shanghai Astronomical Observatory, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
Shanghai, 200030, P. R. China

and

National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
Beijing, 100012, P. R. China

Abstract

In this Letter we extend the heuristic discussion of [1] to a Schwarzschild-de Sitter spacetime (**SdS**), based on the generalized uncertainty principle (**GUP**). We try to explain the present value of the vacuum energy density. An inequality is put forward as an explanation for the smallness of the cosmological constant, and the relationship between the Bekenstein and the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy bounds is also briefly discussed.

Key Words: generalized uncertainty principle, temperature, entropy, cosmological constant.

PACS numbers: 98. 80. Es, 04. 62. +v, 04.70. -s

Although we do not possess a complete quantum theory of gravity, some features which a complete theory is likely to possess may be already embodied in well established laws of physics. For example, taking into account gravity, Heisenberg's uncertainty principle may be changed as [1]-[12]

$$\Delta x \geq \frac{1}{\Delta p} + \lambda(\Delta p), \quad (1)$$

which implies a minimal length $2\sqrt{\lambda}$, where λ is of order of the Planck area $l_p^2 \sim G$. The second term on the right hand side of (1), the **UV/IR** correspondence [13] term, was first derived from string theory [2, 3], from the scattering amplitude of a high energy string. Obviously, this **UV/IR** correspondence agrees with the features of a string, since energy increases with its length. Some Gedanken [4]-[6] verify this correspondence, and its algebra has been investigated [7, 8]. Some effects of the generalized uncertainty relation have been investigated by [11], such as deformation of the black body radiation spectrum, and convergence of the vacuum energy (however, it is still a factor 10^{120} greater than observational values). In fact, [10] first

*E-mail: xiang.lee@163.com

pointed out the deformation of black body radiation due to the GUP. However, [10] give an equation of state different from [11] and the vacuum energy is still divergent. The quantum correction to the entropy of a black hole was investigated using this equation of state in [11], and the divergence appearing in the brick wall model [14] was found to be removed [15].

The cosmological constant (Λ) problem is a challenge to theoretical physics (see the recent review [16] and references therein). As the vacuum energy density, the natural value for Λ will be of the same order as the Planck mass squared, $\sim m_p^2$ [18]. However, current astronomical observations show that

$$\frac{\Lambda}{m_p^2} \sim 10^{-120}. \quad (2)$$

We can treat Λ as the “effective vacuum energy” or “effective cosmological constant” by introduction of a “bare cosmological constant” on the left hand side of Einstein’s equations. This is required to match the natural value of Λ with perfect accuracy, namely, “fine tuning”. By what mechanism is such fine tuning achieved? It has been argued that the observed cosmological constant arises from quantum fluctuations in the vacuum energy density rather than the vacuum energy density itself [17], however the mechanism of fine tuning is still unclear. In Euclidean quantum gravity, the transition amplitude between two field configurations on different hypersurfaces becomes divergent when $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$ [18]. Hawking therefore argues that Λ is probably zero. The effects of a wormhole may also lead to a vanishing of Λ [19, 20, 21]. However, evidence that the Universe is expanding at an increasing rate implies that the cosmological constant is positive [22]¹.

If the **GUP** is a fundamental element in quantum gravity, it should qualitatively explain the smallness of the cosmological constant, at least at a phenomenological level. The aims of this Letter are to investigate the effects of the GUP on the thermodynamics of a Schwarzschild-de Sitter spacetime, and discuss the implications for the cosmological constant problem.

Let us start from the Schwarzschild-de Sitter geometry

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r} - \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2 \right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r} - \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r^2 \right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega, \quad (3)$$

where Λ is the effective cosmological constant which corresponds to the effective density of vacuum energy, $\Lambda/8\pi$.² The cosmological horizon r_c is given by

$$1 - \frac{2M}{r_c} - \frac{1}{3}\Lambda r_c^2 = 0, \quad (4)$$

and thus the mass

$$M = \frac{1}{2} \left(r_c - \frac{\Lambda}{3} r_c^3 \right), \quad (5)$$

¹Amongst other candidates are quintessence, as well as phantom and alternate theories of gravity, but Λ is the simplest choice.

²In the following discussions, when talking about the vacuum energy or the cosmological constant, we mean it is “effective”.

and the surface gravity at the horizon is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_c &= -\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r} - \frac{1}{3} \Lambda r^2 \right)'_{r=r_c} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \Lambda r_c - \frac{1}{2r_c},\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

where we have used Eq.(5). We can easily verify that

$$dM = -\frac{\kappa_c}{8\pi} dA_c - \frac{V}{8\pi} d\Lambda,\tag{7}$$

where Λ is treated as a variable, and $V = 4\pi r_c^3/3$ is the volume of the Schwarzschild-de Sitter space[24, 28]. Note that Eqs.(4)-(7) are valid almost to the black hole, if r_c is understood as the radius of the hole's horizon, and only the definition of the surface gravity is changed by a minus sign. For clarity, r_c denotes the cosmological horizon and r_+ the black hole horizon.

The thermodynamics of dS and asymptotic dS spacetimes have been investigated in references [23]-[29], where the temperatures are still defined in terms of the surface gravity of the horizons. It is difficult to define an equivalent temperature in a SdS spacetime with a black hole. As Ref.[27] points out, we are in need of two conformal field theories to describe the thermodynamics of a SdS spacetime with two horizons, since the central charges of the Virasoro algebra are different for the cosmological and black hole horizons. Here we follow [25]-[29] and introduce two temperatures associated with the two horizons. A SdS spacetime is not in thermodynamical equilibrium, but still static, and in order to arrive at this, we set a heat-insulated spherical shell between the cosmological and black hole horizons. Inside it, the black hole is in equilibrium with a thermal bath of temperature $\kappa_+/2\pi$. Outside it, the cosmological horizon is in equilibrium with a thermal bath of temperature $\kappa_c/2\pi$. Ref.[29] have investigated the thermodynamics of SdS spacetimes by calculating the actions in two Euclidean sections.

Eq.(7) cannot be regarded as the first law of thermodynamics because of the problem of negative temperatures. Furthermore, M is not necessarily the mass of the black hole. For instance, if there is an ordinary star without Hawking radiation, M is not a thermodynamic quantity related to the Hawking radiation. Taking the total energy inside the cosmological horizon $E_0 = M + E_{vac}$ as conserved,

$$0 = dE_0 = dM + dE_{vac},\tag{8}$$

which leads to the first law of thermodynamics for the cosmological horizon

$$dE_{vac} = -dM = \frac{\kappa_c}{8\pi} dA_c + \frac{V}{8\pi} d\Lambda.\tag{9}$$

The second term on the right hand side of the above equation is attributed to the change in vacuum energy density, and represents the variation of the ratio of vacuum energy to matter. Analogous to chemical thermodynamics, it can also be attributed to the chemical potential for the 4-volume of a

Euclidean de Sitter spacetime [24, 28]. Thus, the inverse temperature and the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy are given by, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta &= 2\pi\kappa_c^{-1}, \\ S_{bh} &= \frac{1}{4}A_c.\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

Similar formulae are still valid for a SdS black hole.

The preceding discussion does not involve corrections to the temperature of the Hawking radiation due to the GUP. Strict discussion on this requires a field theory dominated by the GUP. Here we investigate this using an heuristic method first used by Adler et al.[1], who first considered the effects of the GUP on the thermodynamics of a Schwarzschild black hole. Adler et al. also suggest that the GUP may prevent the black hole evaporating completely, resulting in a remnant with the Planck mass. In [1], the temperature of the black hole, i.e. the characteristic energy of the Hawking radiation $\Delta E \sim \Delta p$, is required to satisfy the position-momentum uncertainty relation (1). If Δx is identified as the radius of the hole r_h , the modified temperature reads

$$T \sim \Delta p \sim \frac{r_h - \sqrt{r_h^2 - 4\lambda}}{2\lambda},\tag{11}$$

which in the limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ gives the well known result

$$T \sim \frac{1}{r_h} \sim \frac{1}{M}.\tag{12}$$

However, the argument of [1] is only valid for a Schwarzschild black hole. For instance, the temperature of a SdS hole is given by [27][29]

$$T_{ds} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(\frac{1}{r_+} - \Lambda r_+ \right),\tag{13}$$

where r_+ is the radius of the hole. Obviously, (13) is different from (11) and (12). Let us look at the generalized time-energy uncertainty [5]

$$\Delta t \sim \frac{1}{\Delta E} + \lambda(\Delta E),\tag{14}$$

which implies a minimum time element of order of the Planck scale $(\Delta t)_{min} = 2\sqrt{\lambda}$. Solving (14), we have

$$\Delta E \sim \frac{\Delta t \pm \sqrt{(\Delta t)^2 - 4\lambda}}{2\lambda}.\tag{15}$$

Since in the limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ the above equation should give the usual time-energy uncertainty relation

$$\Delta E \sim \frac{1}{\Delta t},\tag{16}$$

we only take the minus-sign in (15). The Hawking temperature is proportional to the surface gravity κ , which corresponds to an imaginary period

$\beta = 2\pi\kappa^{-1}$. However, the temperature, i.e. the energy uncertainty of the hole and the characteristic energy of particles emitting from the hole, should satisfy (16). Compared with $T_H = \beta^{-1}$, Δt should be understood as the imaginary period of time β , in a Euclidean section of the hole. Thus, taking into account the GUP and substituting β for r_h in (11), we obtain the modified temperature

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \frac{\beta - \sqrt{\beta^2 - 4\lambda}}{2\lambda} \\ &= \frac{2}{\beta + \sqrt{\beta^2 - 4\lambda}}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We can also discuss the modified temperature in another way. It is well known that Hawking radiation is a quantum effect, and that the temperature is related to Planck's constant $\hbar$. In normalised units where $G = c = 1$, the Hawking temperature is given by

$$T_H = \frac{\hbar\kappa}{2\pi}. \quad (18)$$

Recalling the usual uncertainty relation, $\Delta x \Delta p \geq \hbar$, we define an "effective" Planck constant, $\hbar' = \hbar[1 + \lambda(\Delta p)^2]$. Eq.(1) therefore can be rewritten as $\Delta x \Delta p \geq \hbar'$. The effect of the GUP can then be taken into account by substituting the "effective" Planck constant for $\hbar$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hbar &\rightarrow \hbar [1 + \lambda(\Delta p)^2] \\ &\sim \hbar [1 + \lambda(\Delta E)^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Eq. (18) is thus modified as

$$T = \frac{\hbar\kappa [1 + \lambda(\Delta E)^2]}{2\pi}. \quad (20)$$

We obtain Eq.(17) again, when the characteristic energy ΔE as identified as the temperature T .

There is also an imaginary period, which corresponds to the surface gravity of the cosmological horizon. Eq.(17) is also valid to the cosmological horizon if β belongs to the cosmological horizon. The entropy of the cosmological horizon is given by

$$S_c = \int T_c^{-1} dE_{vac}, \quad (21)$$

where the integration is performed at constant Λ .

From (9), (17), and the relation $\beta = 2\pi\kappa_c^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_c &= \frac{1}{8} \int F[\kappa_c(r_c)] dA, \\ F(\kappa_c) &= 1 + \sqrt{1 - \lambda\kappa_c^2/\pi^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Similar formulae are still valid to the black hole horizon. The total entropy of the SdS spacetime is the sum of the entropies of the cosmological and black

hole's horizon [27, 29], $S = S_c + S_+$. Considering the maximum entropy, we have $\delta S = \delta S_c + \delta S_+ = 0$. On the other hand, energy conservation demands

$$0 = T_c \delta S_c + T_+ \delta S_+ + \frac{4\pi}{3}(r_c^3 - r_+^3) \delta \Lambda, \quad (23)$$

then we have $T_c = T_+$, $r_c = r_+$, namely,

$$\kappa_c = \kappa_+ = 0, \quad \Lambda = \frac{1}{r_c^2} = \frac{1}{r_+^2}. \quad (24)$$

Conditioned by (24), the entropies of the cosmological and hole horizon approach their maximums. For example, from (22) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S_c = 0, & \Leftrightarrow \frac{\partial F}{\partial \kappa_c} = 0, \Leftrightarrow \kappa_c = 0, \\ & \Rightarrow \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial \kappa_c^2} = -\lambda/\pi^2, \Rightarrow \delta^2 S < 0. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Performing a similar procedure as from (22) to (25), we can also show that the hole's entropy approaches its maximum as $\kappa_+ = 0$. We notice that the vacuum energy is given by

$$E_{vac} = \rho_{vac} V = \frac{\Lambda}{8\pi} \times \frac{4\pi r_c^3}{3} = \frac{\Lambda r_c^3}{6}, \quad (26)$$

then (5) can be rewritten as the following [30]

$$\frac{r_c}{2} = E_{vac} + M. \quad (27)$$

This is the total energy E_0 within the cosmological horizon, including the energy of the matter and vacuum energy. Combining (27) and (26) with (24), we obtain

$$M = \frac{2}{3} E_0, \quad E_{vac} = \frac{1}{3} E_0. \quad (28)$$

However, Eq.(24) is valid only for the existence of an extreme black hole whose horizon coincides with the cosmological horizon. This is an extreme black hole with zero temperature. It means that the probable ratio of vacuum energy in a Schwarzschild-de Sitter space is 1/3, when the two horizons coincide. The maximum of the total entropy is given by

$$S_{max} = \frac{A}{2}, \quad (29)$$

which violates the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy bound, but still satisfies the D-bound $3\pi/\Lambda$ [31].

Although the maximum entropy is an unattainable limit, because the third law of thermodynamics forbids a vanishing temperature, it indicates the direction of the evolution of a Schwarzschild-de Sitter spacetime. What

is the situation when there is not a black hole but an ordinary star? There is only a cosmological horizon, and therefore from Eq.(22) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
S_c &= \frac{1}{8} \int \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{4\lambda}{\beta^2}} \right) dA_c \\
&\approx \frac{1}{8} \int \left(2 - \frac{2\lambda}{\beta^2} \right) dA_c \\
&= \frac{1}{4} A_c - \int \frac{\lambda}{4\beta^2} dA_c,
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where $\beta^2 \gg 4\lambda$. The first term is the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of the cosmological horizon, and the second term

$$\Delta S = -\frac{\lambda}{4} \int \frac{dA_c}{\beta^2} \tag{31}$$

is the correction due to the GUP. Substituting (6) into (31), we have

$$\Delta S = -\frac{\lambda}{8\pi} (\ln r_c - \Lambda r_c^2 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{4} r_c^4). \tag{32}$$

The entropy is obviously related to the cosmological constant. When fixing r_c , the entropy changes with Λ . In other words, when the total energy is fixed, different ratios of Λ to matter make the entropies different. However, the most probable ratio will make the departure from the maximum entropy minimal, such that the minimal entropy production principle be maintained. We therefore obtain

$$S = \frac{A_c}{4} - \frac{\lambda}{16} \ln A_c + \text{constant}, \tag{33}$$

by setting

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial S}{\partial \Lambda} &= 0, \\
\Lambda &= \frac{2}{r_c^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

The logarithmic correction to the entropy is obtained, like the black holes[32]-[35]. Substituting (34) into (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= \frac{r_c}{2} \times \frac{1}{3}, \\
E_{vac} &= \frac{2}{3} E_0,
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

which roughly agrees with results derived from observations, $(\Omega_\Lambda, \Omega_m) = (0.7, 0.3)$ [22].

The above discussions ignore the entropy of matter, since this part is very much less than the contribution from the cosmological horizon. Furthermore, it is reasonable to suppose that the entropy of matter is independent of the vacuum energy. Thus, the final result will not change, even if the entropy of

the matter is taken into account. Effectively, the matter is assumed to be in a pure state with vanishing entropy.

What else can the **GUP** tell us?

In a regime dominated by the **UV/IR** duality, i.e. of ultra high energy, we have

$$\Delta t > \lambda \Delta E, \quad (36)$$

and the luminosity (or the energy loss rate) of a system reads

$$\frac{dE}{dt} \sim \frac{\Delta E}{\Delta t} < \frac{1}{\lambda} \sim G^{-1}. \quad (37)$$

On the other hand, the energy loss rate

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \frac{1}{4} \rho A \sim \rho \pi R^2, \quad (38)$$

where ρ is the energy density of the system. The variable A is the area and R the length of the system. From (37) and (38), we obtain an inequality which associates the energy density with the length of the system

$$\rho < \frac{1}{\lambda R^2}. \quad (39)$$

It is compatible with the effective field theory with the duality of the UV and IR cutoffs ε and L , $L^2 \varepsilon^4 \leq m_p^2$ [13]. Since ε^4 is the maximum energy density, Eq.(39) can be regarded as evidence for Ref.[13]. Furthermore, from (39) we obtain a small vacuum energy density, $\rho_{vac} \sim H_0^2$, if R is regarded as the present size of the Universe, $R \sim t_0 \sim H_0^{-1}$, where t_0 is the age of the Universe and H_0 is the present Hubble parameter.

The holographic principle [37, 38], relating the dual field theory on the boundary and gravity in the bulk, is regarded as an elementary principle. An important feature of it is that the entropy of a system of matter cannot exceed the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy bound. (Recent progress has been discussed in [31], and some other entropy bounds have been proposed). We believe that the GUP is closely related to the holographic principle, because: (a) the GUP modifies the density of quantum states, and the entropy divergence arising from the brick wall model is removed; (b) Ref.[13] argues that the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy bound requires an effective field theory with UV/IR correspondence compatible with the GUP. Here we discuss the relation between the Bekenstein bound (without gravity) and the Bekenstein-Hawking bound.

When Bekenstein proposed his famous entropy bound [36]

$$S \leq 2\pi ER, \quad (40)$$

he did not take into account gravity. We need an additional relationship to associate the Bekenstein bound with the Bekenstein-Hawking bound

$$S \leq \frac{A}{4G}, \quad (41)$$

where G is Newton's constant. Eq.(39) is such a relationship, which leads to

$$E < \lambda^{-1} R. \quad (42)$$

Substituting it into Bekenstein's bound, we have

$$S \leq \frac{\pi R^2}{\lambda} \sim \frac{A}{4G}. \quad (43)$$

In summary, We have made some heuristic discussions about the thermodynamics of SdS spacetimes and the cosmological constant problem, starting from the generalized uncertainty relation (1). Based on the work of [1], we have derived corrections to the temperature and entropy of the cosmological horizon using an heuristic method. The logarithmic correction to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy was also obtained. For an usual star, the probable ratio of vacuum energy to the total energy is 2/3. The generalized uncertainty principle leads to a bound on the energy loss rate for physical systems. A relation between the energy density and length was suggested and utilized to explain the small cosmological constant, and associate the Bekenstein entropy bound with the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy.

Although a SdS spacetime does not describe the real Universe, the qualitative results derived here are also believed to be valid for a FRW geometry. Consider the following Gedanken: the matter of a usual star is distributed in an homogeneous and isotropic FRW universe with positive Λ , by some reversible and adiabatic processes. According to thermodynamics, these processes are isentropic. Furthermore, such classical isentropic processes should not change the ratio of vacuum energy. This is because a decaying Λ leads to an increase in entropy, which contradicts the nature of an adiabatic and isentropic process. Therefore, the probable ratio of vacuum energy in a SdS spacetime is also valid in a FRW universe. We prefer the thermodynamics of a SdS spacetime without a black hole. After all, the Universe is not dominated by black holes. Although the mass of a black hole can be distributed in a FRW universe by the Hawking effect, some thermodynamical properties of a black hole, such as the heat capacity and the super additivity of the entropy, are essentially different from thermal radiation and usual matter. Furthermore, we do not know whether a reversible and adiabatic process is well defined for the transition from black hole to radiation.

However, Eq.(35) corresponds only to the greatest probability. We cannot exclude the possibility that the cosmological constant has other values. We have noticed that Eq.(35) is not completely consistent with observations. In fact, the weight of the vacuum energy (or dark energy) is constrained by the current age of the Universe[16]. But derivation of (35) is independent of the age, thus it is not a conclusive result. Other uncertain factors could possibly affect the weight of the vacuum during the evolution of the Universe.

We note that the formation of a black hole tends to decrease the weight of the vacuum energy. This is contrary to intuition: the black hole should shrink because its temperature is greater than the temperature of the cosmological horizon. However, Bousso & Hawking observed [39] and Nojiri & Odintsov confirmed [40] that there are two modes of perturbation, corresponding to

the evaporation and **anti-evaporation** of a SdS black hole. In the latter, a drastic effect, the energy from the cosmological horizon flows into the black hole, and may result in a decrease in the ratio of vacuum energy. However, according to our understanding, anti-evaporation occurs only in a system near equilibrium. As we have discussed from (22) to (25), the second law of thermodynamics prefers the anti-evaporation mode of a nearly extreme black hole whose size is comparable to the cosmological horizon. The black hole whose size is much smaller than the cosmological horizon, is still dominated by evaporation, because it is far away from thermodynamic equilibrium.

Another possibility is that the properties of the background are influenced by the black hole: the black hole leaves its impression on Λ and shows a sign of nonlocality. Why so? We hypothesize that it is possibly associated with the black hole information puzzle [41]: can the unitarity of quantum theory be maintained during the evaporation of a black hole? The solution to this puzzle requires a nonlocal field theory (such as string theory) [42]. Recently, it has been argued that the thermal radiation and entropy of a black hole arise due to decoherence. Namely, there exist correlations between the hole and its environment [43, 44]. If so, the environment surrounding the black hole, the de Sitter space, should be influenced by the black hole formation. Decoherence is based on the quantum entanglement of a system with its environment. It cannot be identified with, and must not be confused with dissipation [45]. However, decoherence often occurs together with dissipative phenomena, such as particle creation from a gravitational field [46]. If the formation of a black hole induces cosmological constant decay and then produces particles, the information-loss puzzle is avoided by the correlation between these particles and the black hole. This is because a pure state remains pure only for a closed system. Certainly, it is only a hypothesis, and the mechanism of cosmological constant decay is still unclear. While it is desirable that these issues are investigated further in a rigorous manner, we leave them for future research.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Peter Williams who read our manuscript and improved the English. This research is supported by NSF of China (Grants No. 10273017 and No. 10373003) and the Foundation of Shanghai Development for Science and Technology (Grant No.01-JC14035).

References

- [1] R. J. Adler, P. Chen and D. I. Santiago, Gen. Rel. Grav. 33 (2001) 2101, arXiv:gr-qc/0106080.
- [2] Veneziano, Europhys. Lett. 2 (1986) 199.
- [3] D. J. Gross and P. F. Mende, Nucl. Phys. B 303 (1988) 407.
- [4] M. Maggiore, Phys. Letts. B 304 (1993) 65.

- [5] L. J. Garay, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 10 (1995) 145.
- [6] R. J. Adler, Mod. Phys. Letts. A 14 (1999) 1371.
- [7] M. Maggiore, Phys. Letts. B 319 (1993) 83; Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 5182.
- [8] A. Kempf, G. Mangano and R. B. Mann, Phys. Rev. D 52 (1995) 1108.
- [9] D. V. Ahluwalia, Phys. Letts. A 275 (2000) 31, arXiv:gr-qc/0002005.
- [10] S. K. Rama, Phys. Letts. B 519 (2001) 103.
- [11] L. N. Chang, D. Minic, N. Okamura and T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. D 65 (2002) 125028, arXiv: hep-th/0201017.
- [12] M. Cavaglia, S. Das and R. Maartens, Class. Quan. Grav. 20 (2003) L205, hep-th/0305223.
- [13] A. Cohen, D. Kaplan and A. Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 4971, hep-th/9803132.
- [14] G 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B 256 (1985) 727.
- [15] Li Xiang, Phys. Letts. B 540 (2002) 9.
- [16] T. Padmanabhan, Phys. Rep. 380 (2003) 235.
- [17] T. Padmanabhan, gr-qc/0204020.
- [18] S. W. Hawking, Phys. Letts. B 134 (1984) 403.
- [19] S. Coleman, Nucl. Phys. B 310 (1988) 643.
- [20] J. Preskill, Nucl. Phys. B 323 (1989) 141.
- [21] S. Hawking, Nucl. Phys. B335 (1990) 155.
- [22] S. M. Carroll, Living. Rev. Relativity, 4 (2001) 1, astro-ph/0004075.
- [23] Gibbons and Hawking, Phys. Rev. D 15 (1977) 2738.
- [24] Gibbons and S. Hawking, Comun. Math. Phys. 66 (1979)291.
- [25] M.Cvetcic, S.Nojiri and S.D.Odintsov, Nucl.Phys. B628 (2002) 295, hep-th/0112045.
- [26] R.G.Cai, Phys.Lett. B525 (2002) 331,hep-th/0111093.
- [27] R.G.Cai, Nucl.Phys. B628 (2002) 375, hep-th/0112253.
- [28] C. G. Huang, Phys. Rev. D 65 (2002) 083501.
- [29] B. B. Wang and C. G. Huang, Class. Quantum Grav. 19 (2002) 2491.
- [30] T. Padmanabhan, Class. Quan. Grav. 19 (2002) 5387, gr-qc/0204019.

- [31] R. Bousso, hep-th/0205177.
- [32] Y. Satoh, Ph.D thesis at University of Tokyo, arXiv: hep-th/9705029.
- [33] A. Bytsenko, L. Vanzo, and S. Zerbini, Phys. Rev. D 57 (1998) 4917.
- [34] R. Mann and S. N. Solodukhin, Nucl. Phys. B 523 (1998) 293.
- [35] S. Carlip, Class. Quant. Grav. 17 (2000) 4175, arXiv: gr-qc/0005017.
- [36] J. D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. D 23 (1981) 287.
- [37] G 't Hooft, gr-qc/9310026.
- [38] Susskind, J. Math. Phys. 36 (1995) 6377, hep-th/9409089.
- [39] R. Bousso and S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D57 (1998) 2436, hep-th/9709224.
- [40] S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A14 (1999) 1293, hep-th/9802160; *ibid*, Phys. Rev. D59 (1999) 044026, hep-th/9804033.
- [41] J. Preskill, hep-th/9209058.
- [42] D. A. Lowe, J. Pochinski and L. Susskind et al, Phys. Rev. D 52 (1995) 6997.
- [43] R. C. Myers, Gen. Rel. Grav. 29 (1997) 1217, gr-qc/9705065.
- [44] C. Kiefer, Class. Quantum. Grav. 18 (2001) L151, gr-qc/0110070.
- [45] E. Joos, arXiv: quant-ph/9908008.
- [46] M. Castagnino, and F. Lombardo, Gen.Rel.Grav. 28 (1996) 263, arXiv: gr-qc/9404028 and references therein.